arXiv:1302.3831v1 [cs.AI] 15 Feb 2013

Quantum Entanglement in Concept Combinations

Diederik Aerts and Sandro Sozzo

Center Leo Apostel for Interdisciplinary Studies
Brussels Free University
Krijgskundestraat 33, 1160 Brussels, Belgium
E-Mails: `diraerts@vub.ac.be,ssozzo@vub.ac.be`

Abstract

Research in the application of quantum structures to cognitive science confirms that quite systematically these structures appear in the dynamics of concepts and their combinations and quantum-based models faithfully represent experimental data of situations where classical approaches are problematical. In this paper, we analyse the data we collected in an experiment on a specific conceptual combination, showing that Bell's inequalities are violated in the experiment. Then, we work out a quantum representation in Hilbert space in which 'entangled measurements' occur, in addition to the expected 'entanglement between concepts'. This stronger form of entanglement in both states and measurements has relevant applications in the foundations of quantum mechanics, as well as in the interpretation of nonlocality tests. It could indeed explain some non-negligible 'anomalies' identified in EPR-Bell experiments.

Keywords: Entanglement, Bell inequalities, Quantum cognition, EPR-Bell experiments

1 Introduction

The inspiration to search for the identification of quantum structures in human cognition was born from the investigation of classical and quantum probability structures, more specifically from the analysis of whether classical probability can reproduce the predictions of quantum mechanics [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]. Understanding the fundamental characteristics of classical and quantum probability led us to identify situations in the macroscopic world entailing aspects that are usually attributed only to quantum systems, such as 'contextuality', 'emergence', 'entanglement, 'interference' and 'superposition' [6, 7, 8]. The next step was the development of a quantum-based modeling to deal with 'concepts and their vagueness' [9]. How concepts combine and interact with each other and with large pieces of text, remains indeed one of the important unsolved problems in cognitive science, and the lack of a general theory affects several areas of science, including philosophy, psychology, cognitive science, linguistics, artificial intelligence. It also constitutes one of the missing cornerstones for a deeper understanding of human thought itself. An element of this problem was firstly identified explicitly in the so-called 'Guppy effect' by Osherson and Smith [10], when they observed that for the concepts *Pet* and *Fish* and their conjunction *Pet-Fish*, while an exemplar such as *Guppy* is very typical of *Pet-Fish*, it is neither typical of *Pet* nor of *Fish*. This Guppy effect was studied again in Hampton's experiments [11, 12], with a focus on 'membership weight' instead of 'typicality', and measuring the deviation from classical set (fuzzy set) membership weights of exemplars with respect to pairs of concepts and their conjunction or disjunction. However, notwithstanding the intense efforts, none of the currently existing concepts theories provides a satisfactory description or explanation of such effects [13, 14, 15, 16].

Inspired by our previous work on quantum axiomatics, we elaborated the 'SCoP formalism' to model concepts [9] and cope with the above mentioned problems. In the SCoP formalism, each concept is associated with sets of states, contexts and properties. Concepts change continuously under the influence of context and this change is described by a change of the state of the concept. The SCoP formalism, when complex Hilbert space is used to represent the states, entails 'a quantum modeling scheme for concepts', and was as such successively applied to model concept combinations accounting for the guppy effect as arising from the above mentioned quantum effects, and explicitly modeling Hampton's experimental data [17, 18, 19, 20, 21]. These findings naturally fit in the emerging 'quantum cognition discipline' consisting in the application of quantum structures in cognitive domains (see, e.g., [22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30]).

In the present paper, we work out an explicit complex Hilbert space quantum model for the data we obtained ourselves when performing an experiment in an EPR experimental setting giving rise to a violation of Bell's inequalities [19]. Although we analyzed in depth the experimental aspect of this 'cognitive violation of Bell's inequalities' [19], we had not yet constructed a full quantum mechanical representation of them, and this is what we want to do in the present paper. As we will make clear in the following, our experimental cognitive violation made it possible to gain new insights into the nature and understanding of situations violating Bells inequalities, also relevant for their interpretation in micro-physics.

We consider two specific concepts, *Animal* and *Acts*, and their combination *The Animal Acts*, and analyse the experimental data we collected in a cognitive test we performed on this conceptual combination [19, 20]. This test is described in Sec. 2 where we also show that Bell's inequalities [31, 32] are violated by the measured expectation values. The first result we draw from this analysis is that the two concepts exhibit non-classical correlations that cannot be modeled in a unique Kolmogorovian space [1, 33, 34], and since this happens in a EPR-like measurement setting, we call it 'entanglement'. Then, we elaborate in Sec. 3 an explicit quantum representation in complex Hilbert space that faithfully model the data on *Animal*, *Acts* and *The Animal Acts*, respectively. Moreover, we show that 'both' the state of *The Animal Acts* and the measurements that are performed on it are 'entangled', in the sense that they cannot be represented by product vectors and product self-adjoint operators in $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$. An explicit representation of these entangled measurements fitting data is provided in Sec. 4. We are also able to explain this theoretical impossibility: it is due to the fact that the probabilities in our experiment violate the 'marginal distribution law', which would instead be satisfied in case the measurements would be 'products' (or, 'compatible'). We observe that the 'parameter dependence' implied by the above violation does not entail signaling [35, 36], because our experiment only involves one observer and not two separated observers. Furthermore, such a result is absolutely general and has potentially far reaching consequences in the foundations of quantum physics. Indeed, the identification of the violation of the marginal probability law by experimental probabilities in EPR-Bell tests on local realism [37, 38], could be explained from our perspective by admitting that the polarization measurements performed in this kind of experiments are actually entangled. We plan to investigate this aspect in the near future and devote Sec. 5 to briefly sketch it.

2 Description of the experiment

Quantum mechanics has undoubtedly marked the departure from ordinary intuition and common sense. The notions of realism, objectivity, locality, causality, on which classical physics rest, become highly problematical in quantum mechanics. In particular, John Bell proved in 1964 that, if one introduces local realism as a reasonable hypothesis for a physical theory, then one can derive an inequality for the expectation values of suitable physical observables ('Bell's inequality') which is violated in quantum mechanics [31]. This violation is due to a feature of quantum mechanics which is called 'entanglement'. But, the violation of Bell's inequalities is also seen as a proof that entanglement forbids to cast quantum probabilities into a unique classical Kolmogorovian space [1, 33, 34]. One generally concludes that, because of entanglement, one cannot consider the component parts of a composite quantum entity separately, but the entity must be described as an undivided whole. We have shown in several papers [9, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21] that some genuine quantum features, such as 'interference', 'superposition', 'contextual emergence', 'entanglement', appear independently of the microscopic nature of the entities that are considered and, certainly in conceptual combinations. We aim to illustrate in this section how entanglement appears in the combination of human concepts as due to the violation of Bell's inequalities.

We regard the sentence *The Animal Acts* as a combination of the concepts *Animal* and *Acts*. Then, we detect the presence of entanglement between these two concepts by testing a Bell's inequality with respect to them. For this, we consider two pairs of exemplars, or states, of *Animal*, namely *Horse*, *Bear* and *Tiger*, *Cat*, and two pairs of exemplars, or states, of *Acts*, namely *Growls*, *Whinnies* and *Snorts*, *Meows*. By *Acts* we thus mean the specific action of *Making A Sound*. We introduce the single experiments A and A' for the concept *Animal*, and B and B' for the concept *Acts*. Experiment A consists in participants choosing between *Horse* and *Bear* answering the question 'is a good example of' *Animal*. We put as outcome $\lambda_H = +1$ if *Horse* is chosen, hence the state of *Animal* changes to *Horse*, and $\lambda_B = -1$ if *Bear* is chosen, hence the state of *Animal* changes to *Bear*. Experiment A' consists participants choosing between *Tiger* and *Cat* answering the question 'is a good example of' *Animal*. We consistently put $\lambda_T = +1$ if *Tiger* is chosen and $\lambda_C = -1$ if *Cat* is chosen. Experiment B consists in participants choosing between *Growls* and *Whinnies* answering the question 'is a good example of' *Acts*. We put $\lambda_G = +1$ if *Growls* is chosen and $\lambda_W = -1$ if *Whinnies* is chosen. Experiment B' consists in participants choosing between *Snorts* and *Meows* answering the question 'is a good example of' *Acts*. Again, we put $\lambda_S = +1$ if *Snorts* is chosen and $\lambda_M = -1$ if *Meows* is chosen.

Let us now come to the coincidence experiments AB, $A'B$, AB' and $A'B'$ for the conceptual combination *The Animal Acts*. In all experiments, we ask test subjects to answer the question 'is a good example of' the concept *The Animal Acts*. In experiment AB, participants choose among the four possibilities (1) *The Horse Growls*, (2) *The Bear Whinnies* – and if one of these is chosen we put $\lambda_{HG} = \lambda_{BW} = +1$ – and (3) *The Horse Whinnies*, (4) *The Bear Growls* – and if one of these is chosen we put $\lambda_{HW} = \lambda_{BG} = -1$. In experiment $A'B$, they choose among (1) *The Tiger Growls*, (2) *The Cat Whinnies* – and in case one of these is chosen we put $\lambda_{TG} = \lambda_{CW} = +1$ – and (3) *The Tiger Whinnies*, (4) *The Cat Growls* – and in case one of these is chosen we put $E\lambda_{TW} = \lambda_{CG} = -1$. In experiment AB', they choose among (1) *The Horse Snorts*, (2) *The Bear Meows* – and in case one of these is chosen we put $\lambda_{HS} = \lambda_{BM} = +1$ – and (3) *The Horse Meows*, (4) *The Bear Snorts* – and in case one of these is chosen we put $\lambda_{HS} = \lambda_{BM} = -1$. Finally, in experiment $A'B'$, participants choose among (1) *The Tiger Snorts*, (2) *The Cat Meows* – and in case one of these is chosen we put $\lambda_{TS} = \lambda_{CM} = +1$ – and (3) *The Tiger Meows*, (4) *The Cat Snorts* – and in case one of these is chosen we put $\lambda_{TM} = \lambda_{CS} = -1$.

We evaluate now the expectation values $E(A', B')$, $E(A', B)$, $E(A, B')$ and $E(A, B)$ associated with the coincidence experiments $A'B'$, $A'B$, AB' and AB, respectively, and substitute the values into the Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt (CHSH) version of Bell's inequality [32]

$$-2 \leq E(A', B') + E(A', B) + E(A, B') - E(A, B) \leq 2. \quad (1)$$

If Eq. (1) is violated, a classical probabilistic description of the data, i.e. within a probability model satisfying Kolmogorovs axioms, is not possible [1, 33, 34]. Since this presence of non Kolmogorivity due to violation of Bell's inequality takes place in a specific situation of the joining of two concepts with an EPR-setting satisfying correlation experiments on it, we call the phenomenon 'cognitive entanglement' between the given concepts [19]. When we analyse in detail the complex Hilbert space representation of the data in Sec. 3, we will see that genuine structural entanglement effectively is present, and that the naming is well chosen.

We performed a concrete experiment involving 81 participants who were presented a questionnaire to

A	*Horse* $P(A_1) = 0.5309$	*Bear* $P(A_2) = 0.4691$
B	*Growls* $P(B_1) = 0.4815$	*Whinnies* $P(B_2) = 0.5185$
A'	*Tiger* $P(A'_1) = 0.7284$	*Cat* $P(A'_2) = 0.2716$
B'	*Snorts* $P(B'_1) = 0.3210$	*Meows* $P(B'_2) = 0.6790$

Table 1: The data collected in the single experiments on entanglement in concepts [19].

AB	*Horse Growls* $P(A_1, B_1) = 0.049$	*Horse Whinnies* $P(A_1, B_2) = 0.630$	*Bear Growls* $P(A_2, B_1) = 0.259$	*Bear Whinnies* $P(A_2, B_2) = 0.062$
AB'	*Horse Snorts* $P(A_1, B'_1) = 0.593$	*Horse Meows* $P(A_1, B'_2) = 0.025$	*Bear Snorts* $P(A_2, B'_1) = 0.296$	*Bear Meows* $P(A_2, B'_2) = 0.086$
$A'B$	*Tiger Growls* $P(A'_1, B_1) = 0.778$	*Tiger Whinnies* $P(A'_1, B_2) = 0.086$	*Cat Growls* $P(A'_2, B_1) = 0.086$	*Cat Whinnies* $P(A'_2, B_2) = 0.049$
$A'B'$	*Tiger Snorts* $P(A'_1, B'_1) = 0.148$	*Tiger Meows* $P(A'_1, B'_2) = 0.086$	*Cat Snorts* $P(A'_2, B'_1) = 0.099$	*Cat Meows* $P(A'_2, B'_2) = 0.667$

Table 2: The data collected with the coincidence experiments on entanglement in concepts [19].

be filled out in which they were asked to make a choice among the above alternatives in the experiments A, B, A' and B', and also AB, $A'B$, AB' and $A'B'$. Tables 1 and 2 contain the results of our experiment [19]. If we denote by $P(A_1, B_1)$, $P(A_2, B_2)$, $P(A_1, B_2)$, $P(A_2, B_1)$, the probability that *The Horse Growls*, *The Bear Whinnies*, *The Horse Whinnies*, *The Bear Growls*, respectively, is chosen in the coincidence experiment AB, and so on in the other experiments, the expectation values are, in the large number limits,

$$\begin{aligned}
E(A, B) = &\quad P(A_1, B_1) + P(A_2, B_2) - P(A_2, B_1) - P(A_1, B_2) = -0.7778 \\
E(A, B') = &\quad P(A_1, B'_1) + P(A_2, B'_2) - P(A_2, B'_1) - P(A_1, B'_2) = 0.3580 \\
E(A', B) = &\quad P(A'_1, B_1) + P(A'_2, B_2) - P(A'_2, B_1) - P(A'_1, B_2) = 0.6543 \\
E(A', B') = &\quad P(A'_1, B'_1) + P(A'_2, B'_2) - P(A'_2, B'_1) - P(A'_1, B'_2) = 0.6296
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, Eq. (1) gives

$$E(A', B') + E(A', B) + E(A, B') - E(A, B) = 2.4197 \tag{2}$$

which is greater than 2. This means that it violates Bell's inequalities, indeed, it does so close to the maximal possible violation in quantum theory, viz. $2 \cdot \sqrt{2} \approx 2.8284$. The violation we detected is very significant in proving the presence of entanglement between the concept *Animal* and the concept *Acts* in the combination *The Animal Acts*, because it can be shown that effects of disturbance of the experiment push the value of the Bell expression in Eq. (1) toward a value between -2 and +2. In [19] we also performed a statistical analysis of the empirical data using the 't-test for paired two samples for means' to estimate the probability that the shifts from Bell's inequalities is due to chance. We compared the data collected in the real experiment with the data collected in the 'classical' experiment, where no influence of context and meaning is present. It was possible to conclude convincingly that the deviation effects were not caused by random fluctuations.

3 A Quantum Representation in Complex Hilbert space

We start this section by working out a model for the concepts *Animal* and *Acts* in the Hilbert space in $\mathbb{C}^2$. We denote by $\{|1,0\rangle, |0,1\rangle\}$ the canonical basis of $\mathbb{C}^2$, and associate the abstract concepts *Animal* and *Acts* with the states p_{Animal} and p_{Acts}, representing them by the unit vectors $|p_{Animal}\rangle$ and $|p_{Acts}\rangle$ in $\mathbb{C}^2$, respectively.

Then, let us consider the experiment A which we associate with the measurement e_{HB}. The exemplars *Horse* and *Bear* are associated with the states p_H and p_B, represented by the unit vectors $|p_H\rangle$ and $|p_B\rangle$, respectively. We require that $\{|p_H\rangle, |p_B\rangle\}$ is an orthonormal (ON) basis in $\mathbb{C}^2$, and represent the measurement e_{HB} by means of the self-adjoint operator $\mathcal{E}_{HB} = \lambda_H |p_H\rangle\langle p_H| + \lambda_B |p_B\rangle\langle p_B|$.The same procedure is followed for the other experiments. We associate experiment B with the measurement e_{GW}. The exemplars *Growls* and *Whinnies* are associated with the states p_G and p_W, represented by the unit vectors $|p_G\rangle$, $|p_W\rangle$, respectively. We require that $\{|p_G\rangle, |p_W\rangle\}$ is an ON basis in $\mathbb{C}^2$, and represent the measurement e_{GW} by means of the self-adjoint operator $\mathcal{E}_{GW} = \lambda_G |p_G\rangle\langle p_G| + \lambda_W |p_W\rangle\langle p_W|$. We associate experiment A' with the measurement e_{TC}. The exemplars *Tiger* and *Cat* are associated with the states p_T and p_C, represented by the unit vectors $|p_T\rangle$ and $|p_C\rangle$, respectively. We require that $\{|p_T\rangle, |p_C\rangle\}$ is an ON basis in $\mathbb{C}^2$, and represent the measurement e_{TC} by means of the self-adjoint operator $\mathcal{E}_{TC} = \lambda_T |p_T\rangle\langle p_T| + \lambda_C |p_C\rangle\langle p_C|$. Finally, we associate experiment B' with the measurement e_{SM}. The exemplars *Snorts* and *Meows* are associated with the states p_S and p_M, represented by the unit vectors $|p_S\rangle$, $|p_M\rangle$, respectively. We require that $\{|p_S\rangle, |p_M\rangle\}$ is an ON basis in $\mathbb{C}^2$, and represent the measurement e_{SM} by means of the self-adjoint operator $\mathcal{E}_{SM} = \lambda_S |p_S\rangle\langle p_S| + \lambda_M |p_M\rangle\langle p_M|$. Note that,when $\lambda_H = \lambda_G = \lambda_T = \lambda_S = 1$ and $\lambda_B = \lambda_W = \lambda_C = \lambda_M = -1$, then all these measurement measure the expectation values.

The vectors and operators defined above should satisfy the empirical data reported in Tab. 1 of Sec. 2, as follows.

$$0.5309 = p(H) = |\langle p_H | p_{Animal}\rangle|^2 \qquad 0.4691 = p(B) = |\langle p_B | p_{Animal}\rangle|^2 \tag{3}$$

$$0.4815 = p(G) = |\langle p_G | p_{Acts}\rangle|^2 \qquad 0.5185 = p(W) = |\langle p_W | p_{Acts}\rangle|^2 \tag{4}$$

$$0.7284 = p(T) = |\langle p_T | p_{Animal}\rangle|^2 \qquad 0.2716 = p(C) = |\langle p_C | p_{Animal}\rangle|^2 \tag{5}$$

$$0.3210 = p(S) = |\langle p_S | p_{Acts}\rangle|^2 \qquad 0.6790 = p(M) = |\langle p_M | p_{Acts}\rangle|^2 \tag{6}$$

This system of equations is satisfied by the following choices of the four ON bases.

$$|p_H\rangle = |\cos 7.90^\circ e^{-15.98i}, \sin 7.90^\circ e^{15.98i}\rangle \tag{7}$$

$$|p_B\rangle = |-\sin 7.90^\circ e^{-15.98i}, \cos 7.90^\circ e^{15.98i}\rangle \tag{8}$$

$$|p_G\rangle = |\cos 12.35^\circ e^{-8.95i}, \sin 12.35^\circ e^{8.95i}\rangle \tag{9}$$

$$|p_W\rangle = |-\sin 12.35^\circ e^{-8.95i}, \cos 12.35^\circ e^{8.95i}\rangle \tag{10}$$

$$|p_T\rangle = |\cos 20.45^\circ e^{-24.93i}, \sin 20.45^\circ e^{24.93i}\rangle \tag{11}$$

$$|p_C\rangle = |-\sin 20.45^\circ e^{-24.93i}, \cos 20.45^\circ e^{24.93i}\rangle \tag{12}$$

$$|p_S\rangle = |\cos 2.03^\circ e^{-17.18i}, \sin 2.03^\circ e^{17.18i}\rangle \tag{13}$$

$$|p_M\rangle = |-\sin 2.03^\circ e^{-17.18i}, \cos 2.03^\circ e^{17.18i}\rangle \tag{14}$$

Moreover, the states p_{Animal} of the concept *Animal* and the state p_{Acts} of the concept *Acts* can be represented by the vectors

$$|p_{Animal}\rangle = |0.64e^{i28.24^\circ}, 0.77e^{i29.06^\circ}\rangle \quad |p_{Acts}\rangle = |0.55e^{i35.00^\circ}, 0.84e^{i22.29^\circ}\rangle \tag{15}$$

Let us comment on the above matematical model. We first observe that the numerical value violating CHSH inequality in Sec. 2 is $2.4197 < 2 \cdot \sqrt{2}$, which fits the Tsirelson bound, thus entailing that a Hilbert space model can be constructed, at least in principle [39]. In analogy with what typically occurs in quantum mechanics, the violation of the CHSH inequality in the conceptual combination *The Animal Acts* suggests that entanglement is the natural explanation for the appearance of these non-classical correlations, and that a quantum-mechanical representation in the Hilbert space $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$ could be worked out to model our experimental data. Moreover, one would be tempted to associate the coincidence experiments AB, AB', $A'B$ and $A'B'$ with measurements that are represented in $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$ by products of self-adjoint operators in $\mathbb{C}^2$. A careful analysis reveals that this is not the case for our experiment and opens the way to a number of interesting results, as we will show in the following. Let us now construct the representation in complex Hilbert space for the data collected on *The Animal Acts*.

The cognitive experiment we performed on *The Animal Acts* consists in principle of four experiments that we associate with the measurements e_{HBGW}, e_{HBSM}, e_{TCGW} and e_{TCSM}. In e_{HBGW}, we asked participants to choose among the four outcomes *The Horse Growls*, *The Horse Whinnies*, *The Bear Growls* and *The Bear Whinnies*. In e_{HBSM}, we asked them to choose among the four outcomes *The Horse Snorts*, *The Horse Meows*, *The Bear Snorts* and *The Bear Meows*. In e_{TCGW}, we asked them to choose among the four outcomes *The Tiger Growls*, *The Tiger Whinnies*, *The Cat Growls* and *The Cat Whinnies*. And, in e_{TCSM}, we asked them to choose among the four outcomes *The Tiger Snorts*, *The Tiger Meows*, *The Cat Snorts* and *The Cat Meows*. The measurements e_{HBGW}, e_{HBSM}, e_{TCGW} and e_{TCSM} are all performed on *Animal* and *Acts* in the combination *The Animal Acts*. More concretely, each of the 16 outcomes can be regarded as a state of the conceptual entity *The Animal Acts*, because indeed, although *The Animal Acts* is a combination of the concepts *Animal* and *Acts*, it is also a concepts again in its own, and the 16 outcomes are states of this conceptual entity [9]. On the other hand, each of the 16 states is also each time a combination of two concepts, and each of these concepts that are combined is a state of one of the concepts *Animal* or *Acts*. Also this aspect of the situation plays a fundamental role in the experiments, and it is even this aspect which is principle to us in our verification of the violation of Bell's inequalities, as we will explain still later.

We consider the Hilbert space $\mathbb{C}^4$ as the state space of *The Animal Acts*. Let us represent the state p of *The Animal Acts* by the unit vector $|p\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^4$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
|p\rangle &= c_1|p_{HG}\rangle + c_2|p_{HW}\rangle + c_3|p_{BG}\rangle + c_4|p_{BW}\rangle && (16)\\
&= d_1|p_{HS}\rangle + d_2|p_{HM}\rangle + d_3|p_{BS}\rangle + d_4|p_{BM}\rangle && (17)\\
&= e_1|p_{TG}\rangle + e_2|p_{TW}\rangle + e_3|p_{CG}\rangle + e_4|p_{CW}\rangle && (18)\\
&= f_1|p_{TS}\rangle + f_2|p_{TM}\rangle + f_3|p_{CS}\rangle + f_4|p_{CM}\rangle && (19)
\end{aligned}$$

with $c_i, d_i, e_i, f_i \in \mathbb{C}$ for every $i = 1, \ldots, 4$, and $\sum_{i=1}^4 |c_i|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^4 |d_i|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^4 |e_i|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^4 |f_i|^2 = 1$. The sets $\{|p_{HG}\rangle, |p_{HW}\rangle, |p_{BG}\rangle, |p_{BW}\rangle\}$, $\{|p_{HS}\rangle, |p_{HM}\rangle, |p_{BS}\rangle, |p_{BM}\rangle\}$, $\{|p_{TG}\rangle, |p_{TW}\rangle, |p_{CG}\rangle, |p_{CW}\rangle\}$, $\{|p_{TS}\rangle, |p_{TM}\rangle, |p_{CS}\rangle, |p_{CM}\rangle\}$ are all ON bases of $\mathbb{C}^4$. We further have

$$\begin{aligned}
&|c_1|^2 = p(HG) \quad |c_2|^2 = p(HW) \quad |c_3|^2 = p(BG) \quad |c_4|^2 = p(BW) && (20)\\
&|d_1|^2 = p(HS) \quad |d_2|^2 = p(HM) \quad |d_3|^2 = p(BS) \quad |d_4|^2 = p(BM) && (21)\\
&|e_1|^2 = p(TG) \quad |e_2|^2 = p(TW) \quad |e_3|^2 = p(CG) \quad |e_4|^2 = p(CW) && (22)\\
&|f_1|^2 = p(TS) \quad |f_2|^2 = p(TM) \quad |f_3|^2 = p(CS) \quad |f_4|^2 = p(CM) && (23)
\end{aligned}$$

The self-adjoint operators that represent the four measurements can easily be constructed. For example, let us consider e_{HBGW} and denote the outcomes *The Horse Growls*, *The Horse Whinnies*, *The Bear Growls* and *The Bear Whinnies* by values $\lambda_{HG}, \lambda_{HW}, \lambda_{BG}, \lambda_{BW} \in \mathbb{R}$ (actually, $\lambda_{HG} = \lambda_{BW} = 1$ and $\lambda_{HW} = \lambda_{BG} = -1$, when our measurements measures the expectation values). Then,

$$\mathcal{E}_{HBGW} = \lambda_{HG}|p_{HG}\rangle\langle p_{HG}| + \lambda_{HW}|p_{HW}\rangle\langle p_{HW}| + \lambda_{BG}|p_{BG}\rangle\langle p_{BG}| + \lambda_{BW}|p_{BW}\rangle\langle p_{BW}| \qquad (24)$$

is the self-adjoint operator in $\mathbb{C}^4$ representing the measurement e_{HBGW}, where its spectral family is $\{|p_{HG}\rangle\langle p_{HG}|, |p_{HW}\rangle\langle p_{HW}|, |p_{BG}\rangle\langle p_{BG}|, |p_{BW}\rangle\langle p_{BW}|\}$.

To introduce the notions of 'product state' and 'product measurement' we consider the canonical isomorphism between $\mathbb{C}^4$ and $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$ defined by the following correspondence

$$|1,0,0,0\rangle \leftrightarrow |1,0\rangle \otimes |1,0\rangle \quad |0,1,0,0\rangle \leftrightarrow |1,0\rangle \otimes |0,1\rangle \tag{25}$$
$$|0,0,1,0\rangle \leftrightarrow |0,1\rangle \otimes |1,0\rangle \quad |0,0,0,1\rangle \leftrightarrow |0,1\rangle \otimes |0,1\rangle \tag{26}$$

Definition 1. *A state p represented by the unit vector $|p\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^4$ is a 'product state', if there exists two states p_{HB} and p_{GW}, represented by the unit vectors $|p_{HB}\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^2$ and $|p\rangle_{GW} \in \mathbb{C}^2$, respectively, such that $|p\rangle \leftrightarrow |p_{HB}\rangle \otimes |p_{GW}\rangle$. Otherwise, p is an 'entangled state'.*

Definition 2. *A measurement e represented by a self-adjoint operator $\mathcal{E}$ in $\mathbb{C}^4$ is a 'product measurement', if there exists measurements e_{HB} and e_{GW}, represented by the self-adjoint operators $\mathcal{E}_{HB}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{GW}$, respectively, in $\mathbb{C}^2$ such that $\mathcal{E} \leftrightarrow \mathcal{E}_{HB} \otimes \mathcal{E}_{GW}$. Otherwise, e is an 'entangled measurement'.*

We can now prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *The spectral family of a self-adjoint operator $\mathcal{E}_{HB} \otimes \mathcal{E}_{GW}$ representing a product measurement has the form $|p_H\rangle\langle p_H| \otimes |p_G\rangle\langle p_G|$, $|p_H\rangle\langle p_H| \otimes |p_W\rangle\langle p_W|$, $|p_B\rangle\langle p_B| \otimes |p_G\rangle\langle p_G|$ and $|p_B\rangle\langle p_B| \otimes |p_W\rangle\langle p_W|$, where $|p_H\rangle\langle p_H|$ and $|p_B\rangle\langle p_B|$ is a spectral family of $\mathcal{E}_{HB}$ and $|p_G\rangle\langle p_G|$ and $|p_W\rangle\langle p_W|$ is a spectral family of $\mathcal{E}_{GW}$.*

Proof. We have $\mathcal{E}_{HB} = \lambda_H|p_H\rangle\langle p_H| + \lambda_B|p_B\rangle\langle p_B|$, $\mathcal{E}_{GW} = \lambda_G|p_G\rangle\langle p_G| + \lambda_W|p_W\rangle\langle p_W|$, where λ_H and λ_B are respectively the values obtained for the measurement when *Horse* and *Bear* are chosen, and λ_G and λ_W are respectively the values obtained for the measurement when *Growls* and *Whinnies* are chosen. From this follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_{HB} \otimes \mathcal{E}_{GW} &= (\lambda_H|p_H\rangle\langle p_H| + \lambda_B|p_B\rangle\langle p_B|) \otimes (\lambda_G|p_G\rangle\langle p_G| + \lambda_W|p_W\rangle\langle p_W|) \\
&= \lambda_H\lambda_G|p_H\rangle\langle p_H| \otimes |p_G\rangle\langle p_G| + \lambda_H\lambda_W|p_H\rangle\langle p_H| \otimes |p_W\rangle\langle p_W| \\
&\quad +\lambda_B\lambda_G|p_B\rangle\langle p_B| \otimes |p_G\rangle\langle p_G| + \lambda_B\lambda_W|p_B\rangle\langle p_B| \otimes |p_W\rangle\langle p_W|
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

□

Theorem 2. *Let p be a product state represented by $|p_{HB}\rangle \otimes |p_{GW}\rangle$, and e a product measurement represented by $\mathcal{E}_{HB} \otimes \mathcal{E}_{GW}$. Then, there exists probabilities $p(H)$, $p(B)$, $p(G)$ and $p(W)$, that respectively are the probabilities that Horse is chosen, and Bear is chosen, and the probabilities that Growls is chosen, and Whinnies is chosen, such that $p(H) + p(B) = p(G) + p(W) = 1$, and $p(HG) = p(H)p(G)$, $p(HW) = p(H)p(W)$, $p(BG) = p(B)p(G)$ and $p(BW) = p(B)p(W)$, where $p(HG)$, $p(HW)$, $p(BG)$ and $p(BW)$ are respectively the probabilities that Horse and Growls are chosen, Horse and Whinnies are chosen, Bear and Growls are chosen, and Bear and Whinnies are chosen, for the measurement.*

Proof. Let us calculate, e.g., $p(HG)$. From Th. 1 we have that, in the product state p, $p(HG) = \langle p|p_{HG}\rangle\langle p_{HG}|p\rangle = \langle p|p_H\rangle\langle p_H| \otimes |p_G\rangle\langle p_G|p\rangle = p(H)p(G)$. Analogously, we can prove the product rule for the remaining probabilities. □

A consequence of Th. 2 is that in case the probabilities do not compose into a sum of products, which is the case for the probabilities that we have measured in our experiment in Sec. 2, one of the hypothesis of the theorem is not correct. Indeed, for example, $p(HG) = 0.0494 \neq 0.2556 = p(H)p(G)$. A possibility is that the state p of *The Animal Acts* is not a product state. But it is also possible that the measurements are not product measurements. And, it can well be that both are not true.

Let now the state p of *The Animal Acts* be represented by the unit vector $|p\rangle = |ae^{i\alpha}, be^{i\beta}, ce^{i\gamma}, de^{i\delta}\rangle$ in the canonical basis $\{|1,0,0,0\rangle, |0,1,0,0\rangle, |0,0,1,0\rangle, |0,0,0,1\rangle\}$ of $\mathbb{C}^4$. We choose $|p\rangle$ in such a way that $a = 0.23$, $b = 0.62$, $c = 0.75$, $d = 0$, $\alpha = 13.93°$, $\beta = 16.72°$, $\gamma = 9.69°$, $\delta = 194.15°$, and show that this vector can model the experimental data for *The Animal Acts.* This choice of $|p\rangle$ is not arbitrary. This is the unit vector which allows one to work out the probability distribution for joint experiments which is the closest to our experimental data in Sect. 2, in case only product measurements are taken into account. The state was found by comparing the data with a tensor product representation only using product measurements, and by means of an numerical optimization procedure, which we so not describe in detail in the present article, because of lacking space, and also because the details of this procedure are not of importance for the focus of our article. Details of the procedure can be obtained with the authors for those interested.

Let us use again the canonical isomorphism between $\mathbb{C}^4$ and $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$ to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 3. *The state p of the combination* The Animal Acts *is an entangled state.*

Proof. Let $|p\rangle = |ae^{i\alpha}, be^{i\beta}, ce^{i\gamma}, de^{i\delta}\rangle$. By using Eqs. (25) and (26), we have

$$|p\rangle \leftrightarrow ae^{i\alpha}|1,0\rangle \otimes |1,0\rangle + be^{i\beta}|1,0\rangle \otimes |0,1\rangle + ce^{i\gamma}|0,1\rangle \otimes |1,0\rangle + de^{i\delta}|0,1\rangle \otimes |0,1\rangle \tag{28}$$

On the other hand, $|p\rangle \leftrightarrow |p_{HB}\rangle \otimes |p_{GW}\rangle$, with $|p_{HB}\rangle = X|1,0\rangle + Y|0,1\rangle$ and $|p_{GW}\rangle = Z|1,0\rangle + T|0,1\rangle$ iff

$$|p\rangle \leftrightarrow XZ|1,0\rangle \otimes |1,0\rangle + XT|1,0\rangle \otimes |0,1\rangle + YZ|0,1\rangle \otimes |1,0\rangle + YT + |0,1\rangle \otimes |0,1\rangle \tag{29}$$

By comparing Eqs. (28) and (29), we have $ade^{i(\alpha+\delta)} - bce^{i(\beta+\gamma)} = 0$, which is apparently not satisfied by the given choice of the parameters. Hence, p is an entangled state. □

We come now to the measurements e_{HGBW}, e_{HGSM}, e_{TCGW}, e_{TCSM} and prove the following theorem.

Theorem 4. *At least two measurements among e_{HGBW}, e_{HGSM}, e_{TCGW}, e_{TCSM} are entangled.*

Proof. Let us consider the self-adjoint operators $\mathcal{E}_{HBGW}$, $\mathcal{E}_{HBSM}$, $\mathcal{E}_{TCGW}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{TCSM}$ in $\mathbb{C}^4$ representing the measurements e_{HBGW}, e_{HBSM}, e_{TCGW} and e_{TCSM}, respectively. Suppose that, e.g., $\mathcal{E}_{HBGW}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{HBSM}$, are product measurements. This is equivalent to saying that self-adjoint operators $\mathcal{E}_{HB}$, $\mathcal{E}_{GW}$, $\mathcal{E}_{SM}$ exist such that

$$\mathcal{E}_{HBGW} \leftrightarrow \mathcal{E}_{HB} \otimes \mathcal{E}_{GW} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}_{HBSM} \leftrightarrow \mathcal{E}_{HB} \otimes \mathcal{E}_{SM} \tag{30}$$

On the other hand, the spectral decompositions of $\mathcal{E}_{HBGW}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{HBSM}$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{HBGW} &= \lambda_{HG}|p_{HG}\rangle\langle p_{HG}| + \lambda_{HW}|p_{HW}\rangle\langle p_{HW}| \\ &+\lambda_{BG}|p_{BG}\rangle\langle p_{BG}| + \lambda_{BW}|p_{BW}\rangle\langle p_{BW}| \qquad (31) \\ \mathcal{E}_{HBSM} &= \lambda_{HS}|p_{HS}\rangle\langle p_{HS}| + \lambda_{HM}|p_{HM}\rangle\langle p_{HM}| \\ &+\lambda_{BS}|p_{BS}\rangle\langle p_{BS}| + \lambda BM|p_{BM}\rangle\langle p_{BM}| \qquad (32) \end{aligned}$$

Eqs. (30) entail, because of Th. 1, that

$$\begin{aligned} P(HG) + P(HW) &= \langle p|p_{HG}\rangle\langle p_{HG}|p\rangle + \langle p|p_{HW}\rangle\langle p_{HW}|p\rangle \\ &= \langle p|(|p_H\rangle\langle p_H| \otimes |p_G\rangle\langle p_G|)|p\rangle + \langle p|(|p_H\rangle\langle p_H| \otimes |p_W\rangle\langle p_W|)|p\rangle \\ &= \langle p|(|p_H\rangle\langle p_H|) \otimes (|p_G\rangle\langle p_G| + |p_W\rangle\langle p_W|)|p\rangle \\ &= \langle p|(|p_H\rangle\langle p_H|) \otimes (|p_S\rangle\langle p_S| + |p_M\rangle\langle p_M|)|p\rangle \\ &= \langle p|(|p_H\rangle\langle p_H| \otimes |p_S\rangle\langle p_S|)|p\rangle + \langle p|(|p_H\rangle\langle p_H| \otimes |p_M\rangle\langle p_M|)|p\rangle \\ &= \langle p|p_{HS}\rangle\langle p_{HS}|p\rangle + \langle p|p_{HM}\rangle\langle p_{HM}|p\rangle = P(HS) + P(HM) \qquad (33) \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the 'marginal probability formula' is satisfied by product measurements. This is not the case in our experimental data. Indeed, we have, e.g., $p(HG)+p(HW)=0.679\neq 0.618=p(HS)+p(HW)$. Therefore, if the measurement e_{HBGW} is product then e_{HBSM} is not, and vice versa. Since all marginal formulas are all violated (see Tab. 2, Sect. 2), this completes the proof. $\square$

Theorems 1–4, and the explicit constructions in Sect. 4 of the measurements, provide a sharp and complete picture of the structural situation: 'cognitive entanglement is a relational property of states and measurements'. In case Th. 2 is not satisfied by data, then one can transfer all the entanglement in the state, or in the measurement, or in both, for one measurement. Theorem 4 then shows that whenever the marginal probability law is violated, no more than two measurements can be product measurement. It leaves open the theoretical possibility to construct a representation for all possible data, also for ours, with one measurement as a product measurement, and the others entangled. However, the state will then have to carry all the entanglement of this measurement. With our choice above of the initial entangled state, all measurements e_{HGBW}, e_{HGSM}, e_{TCGW}, e_{TCSM} are entangled in our experiment. We do not report a direct proof of this here since we anyhow explicitly construct the quantum representation for e_{HGBW}, e_{HGSM}, e_{TCGW}, e_{TCSM} in Sect. 4, where their entanglement is made explicit.

The impossibility of elaborating a quantum representation for our experimental data in $\mathbb{C}^2\otimes\mathbb{C}^2$ in which measurements are products is due to the violation of the marginal distribution law. The violation of the marginal law is usually called 'parameter dependence' in hidden-variables research. It is usually maintained that such a violation would imply the possibility of sending faster than light signals ('signaling') [35, 36]. We stress that this is not the case for our experiment, for different reasons. First of all, we do not have two separated observers that can communicate and exchange messages: only the mind of one subject is involved in a decision process of this kind, hence no obvious signals, let alone faster than light signals, can be exchanged by different obervers in this case. Secondly, only collective, rather than separated, measurements are performed on test subjects. Signaling could be a genuine subject of investigation if we had measured *Animal* on a given subject and *Acts* on a far away second subject. Thirdly, the state transitions involved in such decision processes are 'real changes of state' which do not occur instantaneously, hence no superluminal transmission is again possible here. It is indeed the hypothesis that the collapse change of state takes place instantaneously, that brings about the problems related to signaling and relativity within the quantum foundations research. In quantum cognition, the application of the quantum formalism to model cognitive processes, there is the explicit orthogonal hypothesis, namely the collapse change of state corresponds to a decision, and this does not take place instantaneously. This means that it is in agreement with the general approach in quantum cognition, where collapse is a real change of state, to name correlations that violate Bell's inequalities due to collapse changes of state that are not instantaneous and of cognitive nature, 'cognitive entangled'. Nevertheless, this violation of the marginal probability law – if analyzed following investigations in quantum foundation research – was unexpected 'a priori' and has a number of interesting consequences, which we will extensively discuss in Sec. 5.

4 Entangled measurements and their representation

We provide in this section an explicit form in $\mathbb{C}^4$ of the self-adjoint operators $\mathcal{E}_{HBGW}$, $\mathcal{E}_{HBSM}$, $\mathcal{E}_{TCGW}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{TCSM}$ representing the entangled measurements e_{HBGW}, e_{HBSM}, e_{TCGW} and e_{TCSM}, when measuring the expectation value, respectively. Let us firstly consider $\mathcal{E}_{HBGW}$. The ON basis $\{|p_{HG}\rangle, |p_{HW}\rangle, |p_{BG}\rangle, |p_{BW}\rangle\}$ can be expressed in the canonical basis of $\mathbb{C}^4$ as $|p_{HG}\rangle=|x_1e^{i\theta_1}, y_1e^{i\phi_1}, z_1e^{i\chi_1}, t_1e^{i\mu_1}\rangle$, $|p_{HW}\rangle=|x_2e^{i\theta_2}, y_2e^{i\phi_2}, z_2e^{i\chi_2}, t_2e^{i\mu_2}\rangle$, $|p_{BG}\rangle=|x_3e^{i\theta_3}, y_3e^{i\phi_3}, z_3e^{i\chi_3}, t_3e^{i\mu_3}\rangle$, and $|p_{BW}\rangle=|x_4e^{i\theta_4}, y_4e^{i\phi_4}, z_4e^{i\chi_4}, t_4e^{i\mu_4}\rangle$. Then, in the state p of *The Animal Acts*, represented by the unit vector $|p\rangle$, one has $p(HG)=\langle p|p_{HG}\rangle\langle p_{HG}|p\rangle=|\langle p_{HG}|p\rangle|^2$, $p(HW)=\langle p|p_{HW}\rangle\langle p_{HW}|p\rangle=|\langle p_{HW}|p\rangle|^2$, $p(BG)=\langle p|p_{BG}\rangle\langle p_{BG}|p\rangle=|\langle p_{BG}|p\rangle|^2$, and $p(GW)=$

$\langle p|p_{BW}\rangle\langle p_{BW}|p\rangle = |\langle p_{BW}|p\rangle|^2$. By making the required calculations, one finds the following solution

$$|p_{HG}\rangle = |0e^{i71.38^\circ}, 0.15e^{i26.63^\circ}, 0.17e^{i30.07^\circ}, 0.97e^{i263.57^\circ}\rangle \tag{34}$$

$$|p_{HW}\rangle = |0.09e^{i149.21^\circ}, 0.96e^{i322.93^\circ}, 0.96e^{i327.81^\circ}, 0.19e^{i21.14^\circ}\rangle \tag{35}$$

$$|p_{BG}\rangle = |0.12e^{i13.34^\circ}, 0.97e^{i5.44^\circ}, 0.17e^{i189.97^\circ}, 0.12e^{i62.08^\circ}\rangle \tag{36}$$

$$|p_{BW}\rangle = |0.99e^{i71.17^\circ}, 0.11e^{i242.99^\circ}, 0.11e^{i69.46^\circ}, 0e^{i125.70^\circ}\rangle \tag{37}$$

The one-dimensional orthogonal projection operators can be calculated as follows.

$$|p_{HG}\rangle\langle p_{HG}| = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.02 & 0.03e^{i44.75^\circ} & 0.15e^{-i236.94^\circ} \\ 0 & 0.03e^{-i44.75^\circ} & 0.03 & 0.17e^{-i233.50^\circ} \\ 0 & 0.15e^{i236.94^\circ} & 0.17e^{i233.50^\circ} & 0.95 \end{pmatrix} \tag{38}$$

$$|p_{HW}\rangle\langle p_{HW}| = \begin{pmatrix} 0.01 & 0.02e^{-i173.71^\circ} & 0.09e^{-i178.59^\circ} & 0.02e^{i128.07^\circ} \\ 0.02e^{i173.71^\circ} & 0.02 & 0.15e^{-i4.88^\circ} & 0.03e^{i301.79^\circ} \\ 0.09e^{i178.59^\circ} & 0.15e^{i4.88^\circ} & 0.93 & 0.19e^{i306.66^\circ} \\ 0.02e^{-i128.07^\circ} & 0.03e^{-i301.79^\circ} & 0.19e^{-i306.66^\circ} & 0.04 \end{pmatrix} \tag{39}$$

$$|p_{BG}\rangle\langle p_{BG}| = \begin{pmatrix} 0.01 & 0.12e^{i7.90^\circ} & 0.02e^{-i176.63^\circ} & 0.02e^{-i48.74^\circ} \\ 0.12e^{-i7.90^\circ} & 0.94 & 0.16e^{-i184.53^\circ} & 0.16e^{-i56.64^\circ} \\ 0.02e^{i176.63^\circ} & 0.16e^{i184.53^\circ} & 0.03 & 0.02e^{i127.89^\circ} \\ 0.02e^{i48.74^\circ} & 0.16e^{i56.64^\circ} & 0.02e^{-i127.89^\circ} & 0.02 \end{pmatrix} \tag{40}$$

$$|p_{BW}\rangle\langle p_{BW}| = \begin{pmatrix} 0.98 & 0.10e^{-i171.82^\circ} & 0.11e^{i1.71^\circ} & 0 \\ 0.10e^{i171.82^\circ} & 0.01 & 0.01e^{i173.53^\circ} & 0 \\ 0.11e^{-i1.71^\circ} & 0.01e^{-i173.53^\circ} & 0.01 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{41}$$

The self-adjoint operator $\mathcal{E}_{HBGW}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{HBGW} &= |p_{HG}\rangle\langle p_{HG}| - |p_{HW}\rangle\langle p_{HW}| - |p_{BG}\rangle\langle p_{BG}| + |p_{BW}\rangle\langle p_{BW}| \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0.952 & -0.207-0.030i & 0.224+0.007i & 0.003-0.006i \\ -0.207+0.030i & -0.930 & 0.028-0.001i & -0.163+0.251i \\ 0.224-0.007i & 0.028+0.001i & -0.916 & -0.193+0.266i \\ 0.003+0.006i & -0.163-0.251i & -0.193-0.266i & 0.895 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

where we assumed that $\lambda_{HG} = \lambda_{BW} = 1$ and $\lambda_{HW} = \lambda_{BG} = -1$ when measuring the expectation value.

In a completely analogous way, we can construct the other self-adjoint operators.

In the second measurement e_{HBSM}, the ON basis is given by

$$|p_{HS}\rangle = |0.65e^{i69.64^\circ}, 0.48e^{i38.08^\circ}, 0.45e^{i31.37^\circ}, 0.37e^{i269.21^\circ}\rangle \tag{43}$$

$$|p_{HM}\rangle = |0.11e^{i207.96^\circ}, 0.63e^{i208.97^\circ}, 0.77e^{i18.61^\circ}, 0.05e^{i205.71^\circ}\rangle \tag{44}$$

$$|p_{BS}\rangle = |0.69e^{i254.16^\circ}, 0.59e^{i45.44^\circ}, 0.41e^{i28.36^\circ}, 0.04e^{i43.84^\circ}\rangle \tag{45}$$

$$|p_{BM}\rangle = |0.27e^{i70.02^\circ}, 0.16e^{i18.03^\circ}, 0.20e^{i33.61^\circ}, 0.93e^{i85.52^\circ}\rangle \tag{46}$$

while the self-adjoint operator $\mathcal{E}_{HBSM}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{HBSM} &= |p_{HS}\rangle\langle p_{HS}| - |p_{HM}\rangle\langle p_{HM}| - |p_{BS}\rangle\langle p_{BS}| + |p_{BM}\rangle\langle p_{BM}| \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} -0.001 & 0.587+0.397i & 0.555+0.434i & 0.035+0.0259i \\ 0.587-0.397i & -0.489 & 0.497+0.0341i & -0.106-0.005i \\ 0.555-0.434i & 0.497-0.0341i & -0.503 & 0.045-0.001i \\ 0.035-0.0259i & -0.106+0.005i & 0.045+0.001i & 0.992 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

In the third measurement e_{TCGW}, the ON basis is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
|p_{TG}\rangle &= |0.44e^{i80.05^\circ}, 0.73e^{i48.97^\circ}, 0.48e^{i25.56^\circ}, 0.21e^{i274.18^\circ}\rangle && (48)\\
|p_{TW}\rangle &= |0.02e^{i207.84^\circ}, 0.55e^{i211.53^\circ}, 0.83e^{i9.71^\circ}, 0.10e^{i208.15^\circ}\rangle && (49)\\
|p_{CG}\rangle &= |0.89e^{i261.73^\circ}, 0.39e^{i50.87^\circ}, 0.24e^{i26.35^\circ}, 0e^{i44.62^\circ}\rangle && (50)\\
|p_{CW}\rangle &= |0.10e^{i71.50^\circ}, 0.13e^{i19.94^\circ}, 0.17e^{i37.18^\circ}, 0.97e^{i84.23^\circ}\rangle && (51)
\end{aligned}
$$

while the self-adjoint operator $\mathcal{E}_{TCGW}$ is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_{TCGW} &= |p_{TG}\rangle\langle p_{TG}| - |p_{TW}\rangle\langle p_{TW}| - |p_{CG}\rangle\langle p_{CG}| + |p_{CW}\rangle\langle p_{CW}| \\
&= \begin{pmatrix}
-0.587 & 0.568 + 0.353i & 0.274 + 0.365i & 0.002 + 0.004i \\
0.568 - 0.353i & 0.090 & 0.681 + 0.263i & -0,110 - 0.007i \\
0.274 - 0.365i & 0.681 - 0.263i & -0.484 & 0.150 - 0.050i \\
0,002 - 0.004i & -0,110 + 0.007i & 0.150 + 0.050i & 0.981
\end{pmatrix} && (52)
\end{aligned}
$$

In the fourth measurement e_{TCSM}, the ON basis is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
|p_{TS}\rangle &= |0.74e^{i272.32^\circ}, 0.02e^{i42.02^\circ}, 0.62e^{i38.40^\circ}, 0.26e^{i334.31^\circ}\rangle && (53)\\
|p_{TM}\rangle &= |0.02e^{i32.17^\circ}, 0.31e^{i353.95^\circ}, 0.36e^{i242.65^\circ}, 0.88e^{i356.07^\circ}\rangle && (54)\\
|p_{CS}\rangle &= |0.27e^{i278.36^\circ}, 0.87e^{i65.99^\circ}, 0.31e^{i205.22^\circ}, 0.28e^{i223.08^\circ}\rangle && (55)\\
|p_{CM}\rangle &= |0.62e^{i114.51^\circ}, 0.39e^{i81.45^\circ}, 0.62e^{i65.70^\circ}, 0.29e^{i327.92^\circ}\rangle && (56)
\end{aligned}
$$

while the self-adjoint operator $\mathcal{E}_{TCSM}$ is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_{TCSM} &= |p_{TS}\rangle\langle p_{TS}| - |p_{TM}\rangle\langle p_{TM}| - |p_{CS}\rangle\langle p_{CS}| + |p_{CM}\rangle\langle p_{CM}| \\
&= \begin{pmatrix}
0.854 & 0.385 + 0.243i & -0.035 - 0.164i & -0.115 - 0.146i \\
0.385 - 0.243i & -0.700 & 0.483 + 0.132i & -0.086 + 0.212i \\
-0.035 + 0.164i & 0.483 - 0.132i & 0.542 & 0.093 + 0.647i \\
-0.115 + 0.146i & -0.086 - 0.212i & 0.093 - 0.647i & -0.697
\end{pmatrix} && (57)
\end{aligned}
$$

Our quantum-theoretic representation in $\mathbb{C}^4$ of the entangled measurements in our cognitive experiment is thus completed. But, our analysis has potentially far reaching consequences in physics.

5 Toward an application to EPR-Bell experiments

Our analysis in the previous section for the conceptual combination *The Animal Acts* shows that, whenever Bell's inequalities are violated by experimental data and the marginal distribution law does not hold, then any quantum model in Hilbert space describing these data should include not only entangled states, but also entangled measurements, due to this marginal probability violation, which however, as we explained already before, does not imply any form of superluminal communication [35, 36]. Nevertheless, this result is absolutely general, since it does not depend on the fact that conceptual entities are considered. This means that our reasoning can be successfully applied to physical quantum entities as well and, more specifically, to the EPR-Bell experiments testing nonlocality of natural processes and their compatibility with quantum-mechanical predictions [40, 41]. In these experiments, one typically considers a pair of quantum particles (e.g., photons) prepared in a suitable entangled state (e.g., the singlet spin state) and travelling in opposite directions. Each particle is then measured by entering a suitably oriented apparatus (e.g., polarizer) that performs a (e.g., polarization) measurement. This means that a product measurement is considered in which the two measuring apparatuses are spacially separated. The obtained results are then statistically analysed and the violation of Bell's inequalities is finally considered as an experimental confirmation of nonlocality, together with the proof that quantum particles exhibit classically unexplainable correlations. What is implicitly assumed is that, since experimental data seem to agree with the predictions of quantum mechanics and since only product measurements are considered in these EPR-Bell tests, the marginal distributions of two sets of these measurements should coincide, as a consequence of the compatibility of the measurements themselves. This point seems instead to be problematical. Indeed, different experiments, including, in particular, Aspect's [40] and Weihs' [41] showed that *anomalies* appear in the marginal distributions of the measurements that are considered. These anomalies are at the level of probabilities and not at the level of expectation values (which actually enter Bell's inequalities) and have been carefully analysed pointing out that quantum predictions could fail in these EPR-Bell tests [37, 38].

Coming to our results in this paper, we explicitly want to put forward the hypothesis that the anomalies above have a quite different origin and instead suggest a 'stronger form of entanglement' also including measurements. Indeed, the observed violation of the marginal probability law constitute a strong hint toward the claim that the performed measurements are indeed entangled. We can then apply the procedure we constructed in this paper to deal with entanglement in polarization measurements. Let us suppose that data are collected for a given standard EPR-Bell experiment and that non-negligible violations of marginal law are observed.

(i) We can work out a quantum representation in $\mathbb{C}^4$ rather than in $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$, and assume that the initial state is the singlet spin state.

(ii) We can assume that four non-product self-adoint operators representing the entangled measurements exist that fit experimental data in the singlet spin state.

(iii) We can provide an explicit representation of these measurements in terms of non-product self-adjoint operators.

(iv) We can quantify the degree of entanglement of these measurements evaluating their deviations from product self-adjoint operators in $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$.

(v) We can study the connections between parameter dependence, *no-signaling condition* and the compatibility relativity theory [35].

While admitting that what proceeds is very intriguing, we have actually not undertaken the effort of putting forward a complete treatment of this 'entanglement in the EPR-Bell experiments' in the present paper, for the sake of brevity. But, we plan to investigate this potentially relevant aspect of quantum physics in the next future.

References

[1] Aerts, D.: A possible explanation for the probabilities of quantum mechanics. J. Math. Phys. **27**, 202–210 (1986)

[2] Aerts, D.: The construction of reality and its influence on the understanding of quantum structures. Int. J. Theor. Phys. **31**, 1815–1837 (1992)

[3] Aerts, D.: Quantum structures, separated physical entities and probability. Found. Phys. **24**, 1227–1259 (1994)

[4] Aerts, D.: The hidden measurement formalism: What can be explained and where paradoxes remain. Int. J. Theor. Phys. **37**, 291–304 (1998)

[5] Aerts, D.: Foundations of quantum physics: A general realistic and operational approach. Int. J. Theor. Phys. **38**, 289–358 (1999)

[6] Aerts, D., Aerts, S.: Applications of quantum statistics in psychological studies of decision processes. Found. Sci. **1**, 85–97 (1994)

[7] Aerts, D., Broekaert, J., Smets, S.: A quantum structure description of the liar paradox. Int. J. Theor. Phys. **38**, 3231–3239 (1999)

[8] Aerts, D., Aerts, S., Broekaert, J. and Gabora, L.: The violation of Bell inequalities in the macroworld. Found. Phys. **30**, 1387–1414 (2000)

[9] Aerts, D. Gabora, L.: A theory of concepts and their combinations I & II. Kybernetes **34**, 167–191; 192–221 (2005)

[10] Osherson, D.N., Smith, E.E.: On the adequacy of prototype theory as a theory of concepts. Cognition **9**, 35–58 (1981)

[11] Hampton, J.A.: Overextension of conjunctive concepts: Evidence for a unitary model for Concept Typicality and Class Inclusion. J. Exp. Psychol: Lear. Mem. Cogn. **14**, 12–32 (1988)

[12] Hampton, J.A.: Disjunction of natural concepts. Mem. Cogn. **16**, 579–591 (1988)

[13] Osherson, D.N., Smith, E.E.: Gradedness and conceptual combination. Cognition **12**, 299–318 (1982)

[14] Komatsu, L.K.: Recent views on conceptual structure. Psychol. Bull. **112**, 500–526 (1992)

[15] Fodor, J.: Concepts: A Potboiler. Cognition **50**, 95–113 (1994)

[16] Rips, L.J.: The current status of research on concept combination. Mind and Language **10**, 72–104 (1995)

[17] Aerts, D.: Quantum structure in cognition. J. Math. Psychol. **53**, 314–348 (2009)

[18] Aerts, D., D'Hooghe, B. Haven, E.: Quantum experimental data in psychology and economics. Int. J. Theor. Phys. **49**, 2971–2990 (2010)

[19] Aerts, D., Sozzo, S.: Quantum structures in cognition: Why and how concepts are entangled. Lecture Notes in Computer Science vol. **7052**, 118–129. Springer, Berlin (2011)

[20] Aerts, D., Gabora, L., S. Sozzo, S.: Concepts and their dynamics: A quantum–theoretic modeling of human thought. Top. Cogn. Sci. (in print). *ArXiv: 1206.1069 [cs.AI]*

[21] Aerts, D., Broekaert, J., Gabora, L., Sozzo, S.: Quantum structure and human thought. Behav. Bra. Sci. (in print).

[22] Bruza, P.D., Lawless, W., van Rijsbergen, C.J., Sofge, D., Editors: Proceedings of the AAAI Spring Symposium on Quantum Interaction, March 27–29. Stanford University, Stanford (2007)

[23] Bruza, P.D., Lawless, W., van Rijsbergen, C.J., Sofge, D., Editors: Quantum Interaction: Proceedings of the Second Quantum Interaction Symposium. College Publications, London (2008)

[24] Bruza, P.D., Sofge, D., Lawless, W., Van Rijsbergen, K., Klusch, M., Editors: Proceedings of the Third Quantum Interaction Symposium. Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence vol. **5494**. Springer, Berlin (2009)

[25] Pothos, E.M., Busemeyer, J.R.: A quantum probability model explanation for violations of 'rational' decision theory. Proc. Roy. Soc. B **276**, 2171–2178 (2009)

[26] Khrennikov, A.Y.: Ubiquitous Quantum Structure. Springer, Berlin (2010)

[27] Song, D., Melucci, M., Frommholz, I., Zhang, P., Wang, L., Arafat, S., Editors: Quantum Interaction. Lecture Notes in Computer Science vol. **7052**. Springer, Berlin (2011)

[28] Busemeyer, J.R., Pothos, E., Franco, R., Trueblood, J.S.: A quantum theoretical explanation for probability judgment ‘errors’. Psychol. Rev. **118**, 193–218 (2011)

[29] Busemeyer, J.R., Bruza, P.D.: Quantum Models of Cognition and Decision. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2012)

[30] Busemeyer, J. R., Dubois, F., Lambert-Mogiliansky, A., Melucci, M., Editors (2012). Quantum Interaction. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, **7620**.

[31] Bell, J.S.: On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox. Physics. **1**, 195–200 (1964)

[32] Clauser, J.F., Horne, M.A., Shimony, A., Holt, R.A.: Proposed experiment to test local hidden-variable theories. Phys. Rev. Lett. **23**, 880–884 (1969)

[33] Accardi, L., Fedullo, A., On the statistical meaning of complex numbers in quantum theory, *Lett. Nuovo Cim.* **34**, 161-172 (1982).

[34] Pitowsky, I.: Quantum Probability, Quantum Logic. Lecture Notes in Physics vol. **321**. Springer, Berlin (1989).

[35] Peres, A., Terno, D.R.: Quantum information and relativity theory. Rev. Mod. Phys. **76**, 93-123 (2004)

[36] Masanes, L., Acin, A., Gisin, N.: General properties of nonsignaling theories. Phys. rev. A **73**, 012112 (2006)

[37] Adenier, G., Khrennikov, A. Yu.: Anomalies in EPR-Bell Experiments. In Quantum Theory: Reconsideration of Foundations 3, Adenier, G., Khrennikov, A. Yu., Nieuwenhuizen, T. (eds.), pp. 283–293 (AIP, New York, 2006)

[38] Adenier, G., Khrennikov, A. Yu.: Is the fair sampling assumption supported by EPR experiments? J. Phys A **40**, 131–141 (2007)

[39] Tsirelson, B.S.: Quantum generalizations of Bell’s inequality. Lett. Math. Phys. **4**, 93 (1980).

[40] Aspect, A.: Bell’s inequality test: More ideal than ever. Nature **398**, 189–190 (1982)

[41] Weihs, G., Jennewein, T., Simon, C., Weinfurter, H., and Zeilinger, A.: Violation of Bell’s inequality under strict Einstein locality conditions. Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 23, p. 5039 (1998)